

been completed on bills designating wilderness in the Spanish Peaks area of the San Isabel National Forest as well as in the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park, the Gunnison Gorge, and the Black Ridge portion of the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area. We now need to continue making progress regarding wilderness designations for deserving lands, including other public lands in our state that are managed by the Bureau of Land Management. And the time is ripe for finally resolving the status of the lands within Rocky Mountain National Park that are dealt with in the bill I am introducing today.

All Coloradans know that the question of possible impacts on water rights can be a primary point of contention in Congressional debates over designating wilderness areas. So, it's very important to understand that the question of water rights for Rocky Mountain National Park wilderness is entirely different from many considered before, and is far simpler. To begin with, it has long been recognized under the laws of the United States and Colorado, including a decision of the Colorado Supreme Court, that Rocky Mountain National Park already has extensive federal reserved water rights arising from the creation of the national park itself.

Division One of the Colorado Water Court, which has jurisdiction over the portion of the park that is east of the continental divide, has already decided how extensive the water rights are in its portion of the park. In December, 1993, the court ruled that the park has reserved rights to all water within the park that was unappropriated at the time the park was created. As a result of this decision, in the eastern half of the park there literally is no more water for either the park or anybody else to claim. This is not, so far as I have been able to find out, a controversial decision, because there is a widespread consensus that there should be no new water projects developed within Rocky Mountain National Park. And, since the park sits astride the continental divide, there's no higher land around from which streams flow into the park, so there is no possibility of any upstream diversions.

As for the western side of the park, the water court has not yet ruled on the extent of the park's existing water rights there, although it has affirmed that the park does have such rights. With all other rights to water arising in the park and flowing west already claimed, as a practical matter under Colorado water law, this wilderness designation will not restrict any new water claims. And it's important to emphasize that any wilderness water rights amount only to guarantees that water will continue to flow through and out of the park as it always has. This preserves the natural environment of the park, but it doesn't affect downstream water use. Once water leaves the park, it will continue to be available for diversion and use under Colorado law regardless of whether or not lands within the park are designated as wilderness.

These legal and practical realities are reflected in my bill—as in my predecessor's—by inclusion of a finding that because the park already has these extensive reserved rights to water, there is no need for any additional reservation of such right, and an explicit disclaimer that the bill effects any such reservation. Some may ask, why should we designate wilderness in a national park? Isn't park protection the same as wilderness, or at least as

good? The answer is that the wilderness designation will give an important additional level of protection to most of the park.

Our national park system was created, in part, to recognize and preserve prime examples of outstanding landscape. At Rocky Mountain National Park in particular, good Park Service management over the past 83 years has kept most of the park in a natural condition. And all the lands that are covered by this bill are currently being managed, in essence, to protect their wilderness character. Formal wilderness designation will no longer leave this question to the discretion of the Park Service, but will make it clear that within the designated areas there will never be roads, visitor facilities, or other manmade features that interfere with the spectacular natural beauty and wildness of the mountains.

This kind of protection is especially important for a park like Rocky Mountain, which is relatively small by western standards. As nearly by land development and alteration has accelerated in recent years, the pristine nature of the park's backcountry becomes an increasingly rare feature of Colorado's landscape. Further, Rocky Mountain National Park's popularity demands definitive and permanent protection for wild areas against possible pressures for development within the park. While only about one tenth the size of Yellowstone National Park, Rocky Mountain sees nearly the same number of visitors each year as does our first national park. At the same time, designating these carefully selected portions of Rocky Mountain as wilderness will make other areas, now restricted under interim wilderness protection management, available for overdue improvements to park roads and visitor facilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill will protect some of our nation's finest wild lands. It will protect existing rights. It will not limit any existing opportunity for new water development. And it will affirm our commitment in Colorado to preserving the very features that make our State such a remarkable place to live. So, I think the bill deserves prompt enactment.

I am attaching a fact sheet that outlines the main provisions of this bill:

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK WILDERNESS ACT APRIL, 2001

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK

Rocky Mountain National Park, one of the nation's most visited parks, possesses some of the most pristine and striking alpine ecosystems and natural landscapes in the continental United States. This park straddles the Continental Divide along Colorado's northern Front Range. It contains high altitude lakes, herds of bighorn sheep and elk, glacial cirques and snow fields, broad expanses of alpine tundra, old-growth forests and thundering rivers. It also contains Longs Peak, one of Colorado's 54 fourteen thousand-foot peaks.

THE BILL

The bill is based on one introduced by Rep. Udall in the 106th Congress and similar legislation proposed by former Congressman David Skaggs and others in previous years. It would:

designate about 249, 562 acres within Rocky Mountain National Park, or about 94 percent of the Park, as wilderness, including Longs Peak—the areas included is based on the recommendations prepared over 25 years ago by President Nixon with some revisions in boundaries to reflect acquisitions and other changes since that recommendation was submitted

designate about 1,000-acres as potential wilderness until non-conforming structures are removed

provide that if non-federal inholdings within the wilderness boundaries are acquired by the United States, they will become part of the wilderness and managed accordingly

The bill would NOT:

create a new federal reserve water right; instead, it includes a finding that the Park's existing federal reserved water rights, as decided by the Colorado courts, are sufficient

include certain lands in the Park as wilderness, including Trail Ridge and other roads used for motorized travel, water storage and conveyance structures, buildings, developed areas of the Park, some private inholdings

EXISTING WATER FACILITIES

Boundaries for the wilderness are drawn to exclude existing storage and conveyance structures assuring continued use of the Grand River Ditch and its right-of-way, the east and west portals of the Adams Tunnel and gauging stations of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Long Draw Reservoir, and lands owned by the St. Vrain & Left Hand Water Conservancy District—including Copeland Reservoir.

The bill includes provisions to make clear that its enactment will not impose new restrictions on already allowed activities for the operation, maintenance, repair, or reconstruction of the Adams Tunnel, which diverts water under Rocky Mountain National Park (including lands that would be designated by the bill) or other Colorado-Big Thompson Project facilities, and that additional activities for these purposes will be allowed should they be necessary to respond to emergencies and subject to reasonable restrictions.

IN MEMORY OF CHIEF RONALD
"REDBONE" VAN DUNK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to memorialize Chief Ronald "Redbone" Van Dunk, grand chief of the Ramapough Mountain Tribe, from Hillburn, New York, in my congressional district.

In his role as the grand chief of the 3,000 member Ramapough Mountain Tribe, Chief Redbone served his people with distinction and dignity, and honorably led his tribe in their long sought campaign for Federal recognition.

Although the Ramapough Tribe has been recognized by both the states of New York and New Jersey, the Federal government, to date, has denied their request for recognition of their heritage.

Chief Redbone was a dedicated champion of the tribe's efforts to acquire such native tribal recognition.

Chief Redbone organized his tribal members to incorporate themselves, and in 1979, after he was elected chief, the Ramapough Tribe filed their petition for federal recognition, which is now pending before the U.S. Appellate Court.

Chief Redbone wanted the best for his people, especially for their children, believing that recognition of their native American heritage would offer the tribe's children the opportunity to have an identity, a history, and a true pride in themselves as a people.

Moreover, the service of Chief Redbone was not limited to his people. He was a veteran, having served the United States in Germany from 1953 to 1955.

Grand Chief Ronald "Redbone" Van Dunk was a hero, a gentleman, a soldier, a distinguished leader, and a friend. His passing is not only a loss to his family, but to his tribe and to our Hudson Valley region. His legacy is his hope and dedication for the pride of a people, known as the Ramapoughs.

Our prayers and condolences go out to his family and friends, during their time of mourning.

IN TRIBUTE TO YOSHI HONKAWA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an extraordinary individual, Yoshi Honkawa, who will be honored on April 17th as the recipient of the Allen and Weta Mathies Award for Vision and Excellence in HealthCare Leadership. This prestigious award is presented by the Partner in Care Foundation, an organization dedicated to creating new methods of dealing with long term health care needs.

This innovative foundation could never have found a more perfect individual to honor for leadership in health care policy. Yoshi's career in this extremely important field—as an advocate, administrator, and mentor—spans decades and has been recognized by most of the leading health care organizations in California and in the nation.

In 1964, Yoshi joined the staff of the Los Angeles County/University of Southern California Medical Center. Many years later, he and his wife, May, endowed a fellowship fund in health policy and management at the University of Southern California. This act is typical of Yoshi's generosity with all of his resources, including his precious time, with young people entering the health care field. As mentor and teacher, there is no greater friend of graduate medical education than Yoshi Honkawa.

He took special note of the need to increase diversity in health care professionals, serving as a founding member of the Board of the Institute for Diversity in Health Care Management. He is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center, and works with that organization to preserve and promote an appreciation for Japanese and Japanese-American heritage and cultural arts.

Yoshi's expertise in health care policy led to his appointment as a Commissioner on California's Health Policy and Data Advisory Commission. From this post, where he served from 1987 to 1997, he helped shape California's health policy.

It was while he served at Cedars-Sinai that I really came to know Yoshi well and to appreciate his integrity, his knowledge, his ability and his humanity. As the vice-president for government and industry relations, and then as consultant for health care advocacy, I was privileged to visit with Yoshi both in Los Angeles and during his trips to Washington, where he was a tireless advocate for this prestigious medical center.

Yoshi is, to put it simply, a wonderful person and I am honored to express the gratitude of the community for his tireless service and to congratulate him on this recognition of his outstanding leadership.

RECOGNIZING EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, while I am not proud about the gender disparity of wages in the United States, I am proud today to join with my colleagues as a co-sponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

It is unbelievable that women still earn only a percentage of what men earn for comparable work. In the 21st century, women earn 72 cents for every dollar a man earns. In communities of color, the gap is wider: black women earn 64 cents for each dollar and Latinas earn only 55 cents for each dollar a man earns.

According to these numbers, the average woman must work an additional 12 weeks a year to make up the disparity in income. The pay gap has a significant impact on entire families; it is estimated that American families lose \$200 billion each year. Both the AFL-CIO and the Institute for Women's Policy Research report that, if women were paid the same as comparable men, their family incomes would rise by nearly 6 percent. Poverty rates would drop by more than 50 percent.

Unequal pay is unjustified for equal work. It hurts individuals, families, and communities. We must do better to support hard working women and their families. We must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; it is the only right and fair thing to do.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR A COOPERATIVE LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION PROGRAM

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize a program to help states, local governments, and private groups protect open space while enabling ranchers and other private landowners to continue to use their lands for agriculture and other traditional uses.

The bill, entitled the "Cooperative Landscape Conservation Act," is based on provisions that were passed by the House last year as part of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act ("CARA") but on which the Senate did not complete action.

I think the program that this bill would establish would be good for the entire country—and it would be particularly important for Colorado.

In Colorado, as in some other states, we are experiencing rapid population growth. That brings with it rising land values and property taxes. This combination is putting ranchers and other landowners under increasing pressure to sell lands for development. By selling conservation easements instead, they can

lessen that pressure, capture much of the increased value of the land, and allow the land to continue to be used for traditional purposes.

That's why conservation easements are so important for our state. It's why the state and many local governments are interested in acquiring conservation easements on undeveloped lands. It is also why non-profit organizations like the Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust and the Nature Conservancy—to name just two of many—work to help ranchers and other property owners to make these arrangements and so avoid the need to sell agricultural lands to developers.

I strongly support this approach. Of course, by itself it is not enough—it is still important for government at all levels to acquire full ownership of land in appropriate cases. But in many other instances acquiring a conservation easement is more appropriate for conservation and other public purposes, more cost-effective for the taxpayers, and better for ranchers and other landowners who want to keep their lands in private ownership.

But while it is usually less costly to acquire a conservation easement than to acquire full ownership, it is often not cheap—and in some critical cases can be more than a community or a nonprofit group can raise without some help. That is where my bill would come in.

Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to provide funds, on a 50 percent match basis, to supplement local resources available for acquiring a conservation easement. For that purpose, the bill would authorize appropriation of \$100 million per year for each of the next 6 fiscal years—similar to the amount that would have been authorized by the CARA legislation that the House passed last year.

The bill provides that the Secretary would give priority to helping acquire easements in areas—such as Colorado—that are experiencing rapid population growth and where increasing land values are creating development pressures that threaten the traditional uses of private lands and the ability to maintain open space. Within those high-growth areas, priority would go to acquiring easements that would provide the greatest conservation benefits while maintaining the traditional uses—whether agricultural or some other uses—of the lands involved.

The bill would not involve any federal land acquisitions, and it would not involve any federal regulation of land uses—conservation easements acquired using these funds would be governed solely under state law.

Mr. Speaker, the national government has primary responsibility for protecting the special parts of the federal lands and for managing those lands in ways that will maintain their resources and values—including their undeveloped character—as a legacy for future generations. Regarding other lands, the challenge of responding to growth and sprawl is primarily the responsibility of the states and tribes, the local governments, and private organizations and groups—but the federal government can help.

This bill would provide help, in a practical and cost-effective way. For the information of our colleagues, I am attaching a summary of its main provisions.

I also am attaching a recent article from the DENVER POST about how the Larimer Land Trust has helped ranchers near Buckeye, Colorado to assure that their lands, with their resources of habitat for a wide variety of wildlife